



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A6

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,531	03/06/2001	Mary J. Hornberger	10002552-1	4150

7590

08/22/2002

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KIM, PAUL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2857

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/800,531

Applicant(s)

HORNBERGER ET AL. *M*

Examiner

Paul L Kim

Art Unit

2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the dashed line in figure 4 as described in the specification on page 5, line 22. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-15, 17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tuttle et al.

With regard to claims 1, 10, 13, and 14, Tuttle et al teaches a system for remote testing of computers comprising: a network accessible site for providing input for a product under test by a network (fig. 1), a processing system for receiving inputs and presenting the input to the product under test (fig. 1, part 124), and a controller that initiates hardware commands to the product under test (fig. 1, part 122).

With regard to claim 2, Tuttle et al teaches a software process running on the product under test (col. 1, lines 15-19).

With regard to claim 5, Tuttle et al teaches the input being in the form of a script (col. 7, lines 19-30).

With regard to claim 7, Tuttle et al teaches a signal processor that intercepts display information from the product under test (col. 3, lines 41-45).

With regard to claims 8, 9, and 17, Tuttle et al teaches a device configuration being used to configure or select a product under test (col. 7, lines 23-30).

With regard to claims 11 and 15, Tuttle et al teaches the processing system being separate from the product under test (fig. 1, parts 124 & 108).

With regard to claims 12 and 22, Tuttle et al teaches a system for remote testing of computers comprising: a network accessible site for providing input for a product under test by a network (fig. 1), a processing system for receiving inputs and presenting the input to the product under test (fig. 1, part 124), and a switch function that allows disconnection to the processing system (col. 13, lines 46-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle et al.

With regard to claim 3, Tuttle et al does not teach the processing system interacting with *multiple* products under test. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to interact with multiple test devices since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

5. Claims 4, 18, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle et al in view of Neil.

With regard to claims 4, 18, 19, and 20, Tuttle et al teaches a system and method for remote testing of computers comprising: a network accessible site for providing input for a product under test by a network (fig. 1), forwarding the input for the product under test to a processing system and presenting the input to the product under test (fig. 1, part 124), and obtaining display information from the product under test (col. 3, lines 41-56). Tuttle, however, does not teach using a web camera to obtain display information. Neil teaches that the use of a web camera to obtain images is well known in the art (col. 2, lines 22-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify Tuttle et al so that the well known web camera is used to obtain display information, as taught by Neil, in order to inform users or customers the current situation of the products under test.

6. Claims 6, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuttle et al in view of Cromer et al.

With regard to claims 6, 16, and 21, Tuttle et al does not teach the processing system including a database which stores images of hard disk configuration. Cromer et al teaches that a main computer storing hard drive configuration images for client systems are well known in the art (col. 7, lines 24+). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify Tuttle et al so that hard drive configurations are stored on a main computer, as taught by Cromer et al, so as to be able to test different software setups for a variety of computers.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Palmer, Severt et al, and Cardoza et al all teach a product-testing device performed by a host computer over a network. Jessen et al teaches testing multiple computers over a network.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Kim whose telephone number is 703-305-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 10:00-7:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc Hoff can be reached on 703-308-1677. The fax phone numbers for

Art Unit: 2857

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

PK
August 5, 2002


MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800